

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, and 10-16 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the independent claim.

Based on the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as being obvious over U.S. Patent 5,533,145 (“Shofner”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,394,591 (“Jornot”). In particular, the Examiner argues that feature (g) of this claim is taught by Shofner. This feature recites “a closed circuit, including said electronic machine control device and said electronic image evaluating unit, wherein said electronic machine control device utilizes results of said electronic image evaluating unit to control and optimize parameters of a drafting process via said closed circuit.”

Shofner does not disclose a closed circuit through which parameters of a drafting process are controlled and optimized. Rather, Shofner discloses a closed circuit through which an electronic machine control device controls imaging parameters, such as lighting. Shofner discloses that “[t]he optical imaging units 130 and 132 produce image signals that are transmitted through the units 140 and 142 to the system 144 for processing, and the computer system 144 also issues control commands through the units 140 and 142 to the illumination sources 136 and

138 and, thereby, controls the intensity and duration of the illumination on the web 134.”

Shofner, col. 7, ln. 62 to col. 8, ln. 1, and FIG. 8.

While control signals in the closed circuit of Shofner control imaging conditions, such conditions have no effect on the drafting process, as shown in FIGs. 3-6 and 8 of Shofner. The control signals in the closed circuit of Shofner do not control and optimize parameters of a drafting process, as recited by claim 1 of the present invention. Applicants further note that parameters of the drafting process can include, for example, draft delivery speed and friction. Specification, p. 12, ln. 14, 15. Such parameters are clearly not affected by the control signals in the closed circuit of Shofner. Hence, element (g) of claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Shofner. Nor is this element disclosed by Jornot. Claim 1 is therefore not rendered obvious by any reasonable combination of these references.

The remaining pending claims 2-5, 7, 8, and 10-16 are also rejected by the Examiner as obvious. The rejection of these claims is premised on the above obviousness rejection of claim 1, given that claims 2-5, 7, 8, and 10-16 are all dependent on claim 1. Given that claim 1 is therefore not rendered obvious by any reasonable combination of the cited references, claims 2-5, 7, 8, and 10-16 are likewise not rendered obvious by these references.

Applicants: Breuer, et al.
Appl. No. 10/000,454


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: OCT. 12, 2005



Edward W. Yee
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 47,294
VENABLE
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 962-4800
Telefax: (202) 962-8300

DC2/ 687096